

The Second Edition.

AN
ADDRESS
TO THE ^K
PEOPLE OF IRELAND,
AGAINST AN
UNION:
IN WHICH,
A P A M P H L E T
ENTITLED
ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THAT MEASURE,
IS CONSIDERED.

WITH CONSIDERABLE ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS.

BY A FRIEND TO IRELAND.

The King shall drink to Hamlet's better breath,
And in the cup, an UNION shall he throw.

SHAKESPEARE.—*Hamlet*, Act. 5. Sc. 5.

—D U B L I N:—

PRINTED BY J. STOCKDALE, 62, ABBEY-STREET,
NEAR CARLISLE BRIDGE.

1799.



AN
ADDRESS
TO THE
PEOPLE OF IRELAND,
AGAINST AN
UNION.

AN incorporate Union with England, will in all probability be proposed, at the meeting of parliament.

The discussion of the question has been invited by a pamphlet written, if report speaks truth, by a person who holds a distinguished official situation in the present administration. The manner in which he states the question in his prefatory pages, is in my mind most impolitic. The abstract right of two independent nations, of incorporating, or continuing in a state of separation, as best suits their mutual convenience, can never be doubted.

The instances given of the Sabines incorporating with the Romans, and the Dutch provinces shaking
B off

off the yoke of Spanish tyranny, equally provoke an examination, not only of the advantages and disadvantages of an Union with, but of a separation from England for ever. To start such a question, even by implication, would, at any time, be unnecessary, and at the present time is dangerous.

England and Ireland governed by the same Sovereign—an act of parliament establishing, that whoever is King of England, is, *ipso facto*, King of Ireland, bear no analogy to unconnected nations. And why the example of the Dutch, roused to resistance by the cruel oppression of Alva, has been selected on the present occasion, let the writer who brought it forward answer the question.

I will not meddle with the question of separation, but endeavour to prove to the best of my ability, and, I hope, to the conviction of the country, that our present connexion with Great Britain, is far preferable to any incorporate Union.

Among the plausible reasons in favour of an Union, are the vices of our own government. They are so broadly and boldly stated by the writer, that I suppose he has obtained by anticipation, the nolle prosequi of the Attorney General: “ That the counsels of our government are framed
“ in the British Cabinet; that the patronage of the
“ crown is distributed by an English Lord Lieutenant of Ireland; that our Parliament is notoriously subject to English influence.”

Admitting

Admitting these facts, our complaint is, that the interests of Ireland are not sufficiently protected by three hundred Irish gentlemen in Dublin. The mischief then is to be remedied by sending sixty or one hundred to London; and the integrity of Irish representatives is to improve in proportion to the diminution of their numbers, and their removal from the observation of their constituents!

We are told that, situated as we are at present, British interest will always be preferred. If by British interest, is meant the *true* interest of the British empire, which is best promoted, by promoting the interest of every part, which by creating internal strength, gives external power; the cultivation of *that interest*, by an Irish Legislature, will never excite the discontent of the Irish nation. But if British interest is the facility of commencing and carrying on wars, which, undertaken in injustice, continued in folly, terminate in disgrace; the happiness and prosperity, not only of the British empire, but of the human race, will be promoted, in proportion as personal passion or false ambition will find it difficult to involve mankind in such great calamity. Or should British interest be what I am afraid it is at the present day, the stupid, short-sighted interest of the English landholder, which imagines the value of his estate encreased, as the values of those around him are diminished; the narrow self-interest of an English merchant or manufacturer, which would monopolize the trade and commerce of the world; that

wretched self-interest, which hates the prosperity of a rival, and is pained at the success of a friend; the greater the security, against the operation of such an interest, the greater our advantage.

It may be objected, that after an Union, this interest will cease to operate. I deny the assertion. The Union will not change the English landholders, merchants, and manufacturers, into philosophic Statesmen. And the reasons which should induce the British minister to promote the interests of Ireland, as by so doing, he promotes the real interest of the empire, are equally strong before and after an Union. The truth is, no minister, even in the most despotic countries, can resist the prejudices of the people he governs. And in the year 1779, the wisdom of Lord North alone could never have granted, what the high tone of the Irish Legislature, and the imposing appearance of the Irish people, extorted from the prudence of the English nation. The city of Bristol discarded Edmund Burke, because he was *just* to Ireland. The Eleven Commercial Propositions were too beneficial to be conceded, and were, at the petition of the Merchants and Manufacturers of England, changed into the twenty-four, which we rejected as injurious and disgraceful.—Ireland is at this moment as much an integral part of the empire as she would be after an Union, and it is now as much the real interest of Britain to promote her interest as it would be then. I confess, if England were a despotic Monarchy, and that the King made the law, I should
have

have much less objection to the extinction of our Legislature, than at present. The Prince has no reason to prefer the prosperity of one part of his dominions to another; their riches are his riches; their power are his power.

The dependencies of free States are always more illiberally governed, than those of an arbitrary Monarch;* and Mr. Hume, forty years ago, when Ireland was controuled by the British Legislature, and had no free trade, illustrated the position, by comparing the then state of Ireland, with the conquered provinces of the French Monarchy. But, it is said, that Ireland, by incorporating with England, is not reduced to a state of vassalage, but raised to equality, and that the Union is a partnership. It is, indeed, a partnership, of which, if the articles are infringed, Ireland has no redress.

We well know that public bodies are rarely influenced by justice; whoever possesses power will use it to promote the interest to which he is most attached; and whenever Irish and English interest come in competition, it is easy to see which would be favoured. To say such a question can never arise, is absurd. We see the interests of different parts of England frequently in competition with each other, and the interests of the whole kingdom often injured, not only by an injudicious preference of one part to another, but in sacrificing the interests

* Hume's Essay, Politics a Science, 8vo ed. p. 19.

rests of all England to that of London. The respective situation of the countries, and the similarity of their produce will always excite a rivalry in various branches of trade and manufactures. Would Ireland fare better in a British Legislature than different parts of England?

Let their differences be settled by a treaty; and let Ireland keep her own Legislature, to ensure its observance.

England can only violate the treaty, by hostile acts of her own Parliament, or by corrupting ours:—The first will be attended with danger, though not always with success. Future Irish Parliaments may, as former ones have already done, reduce the English to *repeal* such laws. With respect to influence, will twenty Lords, and sixty Commons, in Westminster, be less liable to be influenced than the whole body of the Irish Legislature in Dublin? But on any question where British is opposed to Irish interest, the British will have a majority. To corrupt will be unnecessary. The Irish members, if they are disposed to protect their country, will be told there is no such thing as Irish interest; that all is British interest; and of that, the majority of the British Parliament are the best judges.

Postlethwait,* an eminent commercial writer, when thirty years ago advising England to an Union,

* Vide Postlethwait's Commercial Interests of Great Britain, where an Union of the countries is considered, Vol. 1.

Union, told them, that it by no means followed from an Union, that Ireland should enjoy equal liberty of trade with England, that the facility of regulating and controuling Irish commerce, would be encreased, when the distinct Legislature of Ireland was extinguished, and a few Irish members placed in the British Senate. He spoke from experience. Twice in the first seven years after the Union with Scotland, the Scotch Lords and Commoners united in support of two important articles of the treaty, and vainly attempted to defend Scotch law and Scotch property in a British Senate.* Since that period, with the exception of two or three individuals,† the members from North Britain, convinced of the impossibility of serving their country, have uniformly, with a characteristic sagacity, determined to serve themselves, *and where the Minister is, there are they also.*

A National Legislature is a powerful check on the executive officers of government, and the ministers of justice. When men know that their conduct will be canvassed in the place where they live, by the men whom they daily meet, and with whom they daily converse, they are cautious ;
they

* In the instances of the law of Treason, and the Malt tax.

† Lord Lauderdale is, indeed, a noble exception. Yet his services to the Empire, could not atone for his opposition to the Minister ; and at the last election he lost his seat. I mean not to reflect on the Scotch nation. If there is an Union, Irish members will be like Scotch members. I admire the valour, I respect the learning, and I sympathize with the injuries of Scotland.

they know though influence may prevent punishment, yet it cannot prevent examination. To shield public delinquency is an unpleasing task to any government. To want such protection, lessens the interest of the offenders with their employer. But if the conduct of such men can only be examined in an assembly residing in another country, among those, with the majority of whom they are little connected, not at all acquainted, the restraint will be small indeed. Should an enquiry be instituted, a statement of facts may be opposed by contradictory assertions, difficult to be refuted from the greatness of the distance, and the length of the time elapsed. To accuse is, at best, but an invidious office; it requires great incentives. A strong sense of duty may prompt a man to undertake it. A love of popularity. But at a distance from the scene of action, that warm indignation, raised by having been an eye-witness of injustice, or the sufferer of wrong, is seldom excited, and the prosecution of the subordinate officer of a province, creating little interest at the seat of empire, offers no harvest to ambitious talents. In such cases the probability is, that the accused will not only be protected, but justified. Ireland and Scotland exhibit two strong instances of these truths. A Judge, in one of our Courts, held a man to excessive bail; he was only not censured. And the country was saved from the repetition of such an act. In Scotland two sentences of the Court of Justiciary were considered, by some of the ablest of the Scotch Bar, as
contradictory



contradictory to the law of Scotland, as holding a man to excessive bail, is to the law of England. The eloquence of Fox only rendered more conspicuous the misery of not having a National Legislature, for the Scotch Judges were applauded and justified by a British Parliament.

Our Parliament may have improperly sacrificed the interest of Ireland to that of England; they may have raised more money from the people than they ought; they may have loaded themselves and others with places and pensions. Yet their vote on the appropriation of the surplus revenue. Their octennial bill. The free trade. The repeal of Poyning's law. The repeal of the 6th of Geo. I. The act of renunciation. The money granted, from time to time, for the erection of public buildings, for the improvement of barren lands, for the making of canals. Are strong features of their being an Irish Parliament.

If the services of the Irish Legislature bear no proportion to their demerits—If they are that venal body, which they are called by the writer: By whom have they been corrupted? By Britain. And shall we permit Britain to take advantage of her own wrong? Shall Britain who has corrupted our Parliament to a base compliance with British interest, (not the real interest of the British Empire), but the selfish interest of illiberal landholders, avaricious merchants and manufacturers; Shall she reap the fruits of her own baseness, and

force you to an Union to promote that false interest, which, if pursued much longer, will inevitably accomplish her ruin? Shall she, after having betrayed the Parliament almost to their own undoing, reduced the country into a situation, in which passion is principle, and prejudice reason, operating on the avarice and timidity of one part of the community, and the indignant resentment of the other, make both concur in the annihilation of their independence, and the destruction of their country. *I have put the question—I do not fear the answer.*

The question of Union stands on a very different ground from what it did thirty years ago. At that period the ascribed effects of the Union, like the touch of the enchanter's wand, were to change the whole face of the country. Our fields were to echo with the whistle of the ploughman—The hum of the loom and the shuttle was to be heard in our streets—Our rivers were to be lined with warehouses—The sea was to be covered with our ships—And we were to share in the commerce and Constitution of Britain. We then had a controuling English Parliament, a Legislative Privy Council, a Senate, the members of which never returned into the body of the people, except by the exertion of Royal prerogative, or the death of the Sovereign, which had no command over the public purse: a King's letter being sufficient to draw any sum from the Treasury. We had not a Habeas Corpus act, and we had dependent

dependent judges. Such was our constitution—Trade, and manufactures, we had none, except the making and exporting linen cloth. Our woollen manufacture was nearly extinguished, and only supplied a trifling part of domestic consumption. We could neither send woollen cloth to England or the Continent, and our surplus, raw wool, was either exported to Britain, or smuggled into France and Holland. What have we now? An octennial House of Commons, a Legislature, uncontrouled either by a British parliament, or an Irish privy-council; a responsible Treasury-board, a limited pension-list, an unrestricted trade—and all without an Union.

Experience has demonstrated that even then, an Union would have been too great a price for these advantages. What has England now to offer? Nothing but the regulation of the channel trade. To what are these concessions of England to be ascribed? Is it to that enlightened policy which dictates, that the advancement of the interest of each part, is the promotion of the true interest of the whole Empire? Or is it to that prudence which, in opposition to a narrow short-sighted interest, complied with a demand, which at the time it was unsafe to resist? Attribute them to either cause, you cannot draw an inference in favour of an Union. If to the former, sound policy will in a short time produce an equitable settlement of what remains to be adjusted. If to the latter, an Union, so far from inducing an equitable settlement of these

C 2
points,

points, will the better enable England to re-assume what she has already granted. And let the articles of the Union be as beneficial as the warmest Irish heart can desire; the examples which have been given of Scotland demonstrate, that the treaty will be observed or infringed as best suits British interest.

I shall now endeavour to prove, that in the present state of the connection of the two countries, it is the real interest of England to cultivate Irish prosperity. Ireland has been well styled, *the brightest jewel in the British crown*. If Ireland was to pass into the hands of any other power, England could not long sustain her situation in Europe. Ireland almost totally victuals the navy of England, and supplies a third of her soldiers and sailors. Her insular situation, and the martial spirit of her numerous population, would be powerful instruments in the hands of a rival, for the destruction of British commerce, and British liberty. And I cannot help thinking, though the dissolution of the connection would be highly prejudicial to their mutual interests, that England would experience the greater injury. She must either hold Ireland by force or affection. If by the first, the possession is not only useless but burthenfome. Commerce is incompatible with a military government. New inhabitants will not come to such a country, the old will emigrate. The principle of a commercial monopoly of one country against the whole world, or against her different dependencies, is proved by the best writers on political œconomy.

to

to be false. It produces a temporary prosperity. By acquiring the command of the market, it can put its own price on commodities, and levy an exorbitant profit. Domestic expensive establishments and ambitious projects, are the consequences of unnatural gain, and in time, she is underfold by foreign countries. The greatness of her expenditure renders her unable to lower the price of her goods; her customers for some time continue to deal with her from habit, though they may be more cheaply supplied elsewhere. At length she is beaten out of every market.—Her oppressed dependencies have neither the inclination nor ability to assist her. They rejoice in her fall, and she sinks—never to rise again. Nothing but a timely departure from such a principle, can save the country which has adopted it from ruin.

I will now shew the former conduct of England to Ireland, to have been equally destructive to British and Irish interest. In the reign of Charles II. the Parliament prohibited the importation of Irish cattle into England. What was the consequence? It gave a monopoly to a few breeding counties, of butcher's meat, which, encreasing the price of provisions, raised the price of labour, made goods dearer; and these goods going to a foreign market, at an artificial value, were underfold by the same goods of other countries; which, from the greater cheapness of labour, were disposed of at their natural value; less money being brought into the country by foreign trade, the home consumption,

sumption, sunk in price.* Ireland, at first reduced to great distress, turned her industry into another channel. She began to make butter, and to fatten cattle for the beef trade; and these provisions, exported to other countries, increased the ability of foreigners to undersell the English manufacturers. She cultivated the breed of sheep, and under the patronage of the great Duke of Ormond, whose memory every Irishman should adore, the Woollen manufacture was planted.

In thirty years, our improvement was so rapid, that English jealousy was excited, and William, at the revolution, was obliged to promise to discourage the Irish Woollen manufacture. Bills were passed to prevent the exportation of woollen cloth to England, or any part of the world; and England secured to herself a monopoly of the Irish raw wool. With the same persecuting spirit, we were excluded from the American and West Indian trades. Rum was the only article we could import from the West Indies, in return for the commodities we sent there, without first landing it in England. It was the only exception in a long list of goods enumerated by several English acts of parliament. Well might it be said in the letters of Guatimozin,† “that you could trace Ireland through the statute-book of England, by penal law, as a wounded man in a crowd was tracked by his blood.” Did England profit by these wise regulations? By the

* Vide Sir Matthew Decker, also Pofflethwaite's Com. Int.

† Written by the late Dr. Frederick Jebb.

the first, twenty thousand Irish manufacturers were obliged to seek for bread in foreign countries, and carried along with them their art. The French finding it necessary to mix Irish wool with their own, gave for it a better price than England. An immense quantity was annually smuggled into France, and she underfold Britain in several branches of that manufacture. At length, a smuggling trade affording uncertain profit, and the manufacturer having no second market. The Irish sheep diminished, and England lost her profit on manufacturing the Irish wool. Her American and West Indian exclusions availed her as little. Ireland paid annually to France, for molasses and sugar, 150,000*l.* and until the direct importation of pitch, tar, &c. was permitted, we paid every year to foreigners, 100,000*l.* for these articles.* By the free trade of 1779, we have acquired a free exportation to all countries, of our woollen manufactures, England excepted.† This, though not of the same advantage, as it would have been forty or fifty years ago, will, at a future day, revive our lost woollen trade. And I have been informed by persons conversant in these matters, that it has much improved since the year 1779. We now enjoy the West Indian trade,

* Vide Postlethwaite.

† By her injudicious duties on the importation of sail-cloth from Ireland, and the bounty on its exportation from England to this country; that manufacture is, in a great measure, lost to the empire, and delivered up to the Russians, Dutch, and Germans. Like the dog in the fable, she bit at a shadow, and lost the substance.

trade, on the same terms as England. We import into Ireland on the same terms they import into England, and our draw-back is exactly the same on exporting West Indian goods to England, that there is on exporting West Indian goods to Ireland. If there is an Union, can England give you the West Indian trade on better terms than you have it already? In regulating the channel trade, will she permit a competition between Irish and English woollens, in the British market? If she did (which * is not to be expected) from not doing more at present than is sufficient for a small home demand, it would be useless. We have now no superfluous raw wool; we have rather less than our internal wants require; and the price of wool, on account of its scarcity, is much risen in the home market. We may be certain that England will not exclude her own woollen goods from the Irish market, by agreeing to protecting duties, in favour of ours. In other branches of manufacture will she consent to protecting

* Certainly she never will, for it was once proposed to England, in order to revive the Irish woollen manufacture, the decline of which was alike pernicious to both countries, to permit, on paying a large duty, the importation of Irish woollens into England; which duty was to be drawn back on exportation from England to foreign countries.

Vide Pofflethwaite's Commercial Interests of Great Britain.

This was the mode which occurred to that writer, of encouraging the Irish woollens, without permitting them to come in competition with the English, in the British market. We can now export them to any other country but to England.

protecting duties? An Irish Parliament may at a future period grant Irish manufactures protecting duties. But if such duties were conceded to obtain an Union, no British Parliament would continue them contrary to British interest, notwithstanding the opposition a few Irish Members might make to their repeal. I have already stated that the Scotch law of treason was altered, and the malt tax imposed on Scotland in violation of the Union, in despite of the unanimous exertions of the Scotch Members in both Houses. Open ports, mutual equality*, are then to be the basis of the treaty. This would be real inequality. From the largeness of capital, and the improvements in machinery, the British manufacturer can at this moment undersell the Irish manufacturer in the Irish market. When the trifling duties on the importation of English goods are removed, his ability to do so will be still improved. The same causes will enable the English to undersell the Irish in foreign markets. Will British capital and British improvement migrate to Ireland for the command of markets they already possess?

D

Admitting

• Except in the article of Irish woollens, which I think I have shewn in a former note, England will never permit entering her country free from duty, or in any way in which they can possibly vie with her woollens in her home market. Even if she would, Ireland would reap, at this moment, little advantage, on account of the present state of her woollen manufacture. And whoever attentively considers the detailed reasoning of these pages, will see, that we may expect to obtain it one day without an Union.

Admitting that somewhat more money might be made, nothing is more difficult to move than trade and manufacture. They continue in the channel in which they have been accustomed to flow, for a long time after the cause of their first direction has ceased to operate. Add to these things the deep rooted prejudice which those classes of men who compose in England the merchants, the manufacturers, and the people employed by them feel, against Ireland, and the probability of British capital fixing in this kingdom is still more diminished. But supposing, for a moment, that the Union is to give us great commercial * capability, which I think I have shewn will not be the case, we must, no doubt, pay our quota to the expence of the empire. We obtained great advantages in 1779, without taxation. Did British capital then flow into the country? If commercial capability, unpurchased by taxation, did not bring British capital into the country, will it when clogged by taxation? And if unburthened, it brought capital into the country—Does it prove that it will do so when incumbered? We have for one hundred and forty years enjoyed the Linen manufacture to as much advantage as we can possibly do any other manufacture after an Union. How much British capital has been employed in it? Not a shilling.

* What I mean to assert is, that the primary introduction, the consequent establishment, and the present flourishing state of the linen manufacture, are not to be ascribed to English capital settling in the country. Nor in all my enquiries, have I met with any thing to contradict this position.

shilling. From the moment of its first introduction from the Low Countries, down to the present day, it has been carried on by capital, acquired by Irish industry, originally excited, by encouragement, from the Irish Government. We owe nothing to England. She made her choice, she gave us the Linen and reserved the Woollen manufacture. And at this day she takes no more of Irish Linen, than is consistent with her interests. In those branches in which Holland and Germany excel, she gives them the preference. And if the duties on these foreign Linens are 37 per cent in our favour, if she gives a bounty of three halfpence per yard on the exportation of Irish Linens of a particular value to foreign countries.* We give her Woollens the exclusive preference in our home market; for from no other country do we import Woollen goods. The threat of withdrawing the bounty and laying on duties; held out by the writer, is nugatory. Let her do so. She must still take our Linens as those she takes from Ireland, she can not get elsewhere. She would only encrease the price of linen to her own people. If the manufacturer pays more for his shirt, he must get a better price

price for his labour. The article on which his labours is employed is sold at a dearer rate ; therefore there is a greater chance of its being beaten out of the foreign market. England has no linen manufacture worth mentioning. We could do better without her woollens, than she could without our linens. We have it always in our power to make her listen to reason on that point by laying a heavy duty on her woollens.

If England has not corn sufficient for her subsistence, she will not refuse to purchase from Ireland, to preserve herself from famine, merely because we are so absurd as to reject an Union ; though she swears it is for our good. She deigned during the present war to purchase from America, who successfully rebelled against her authority. If Ireland can supply her on better terms than other countries, she will deal with her, with or without an Union ; and if not, England in no situation will commit the egregious folly of buying provisions dear, when she can buy them cheap. If Ireland can sell on equal terms, so long as our present connection subsists, it is her interest to give us the preference.

There is an hackneyed negative kind of argument frequently used, viz. though Dublin would be injured, yet the South would be improved, and Cork and Waterford materially served. This is partly true, and partly false. Dublin would be injured, but these towns would not now be served.

Cork

Cork and Waterford, lying favourably for the American and West-Indian trade, were the privilege of directly importing into Ireland, the returns of the cargoes exported from hence to America and the West-Indies, not to be acquired without an Union, the argument would avail. In 1779 this was obtained.* Having shewn that without an Union we have obtained commercial advantages, which forty years ago would have been considered as an equivalent for one, and as we can only reason about the future, from a knowledge of the past, I infer that we should reject an Union. We shall not gain any share in the East-India trade as a Nation, and as individuals we have an equal capacity with every Englishman and Scotchman of purchasing India stock. I have proved that the real interests of Britain call for an equitable settlement of what remains to be adjusted between the two countries, independent of an Union. That if she will not consult the real interest of the empire before an Union, she will not do it after one. That in the latter case she can more easily sacrifice the real interest of Ireland to her own false selfish interest, when both countries have but one legislature; that we have a better chance of the channel trade being fairly regulated by keeping our own Parliament. That if the terms of the Union should be advantageous to the country, (which in all

* As to a dock-yard being established at Cork after an Union. If it is the interest of England to do so—Why not do it now? And if it is not her interest. She will not do it then.

all probability they will not) Scotland proves we have no security against their violation. I therefore assert, that we shall not gain commercial benefits from an Union.

Absentee landlords, middle men, rack rents, and tithes are the great bane of Ireland; I know nothing to prevent our own Legislature from establishing a modus for tithes, making some provision for the Roman Catholic Clergy; and enlarging the bounty of the Crown to Dissenting Ministers; nor can I perceive the indispensable necessity of these measures being accompanied by an Union. The best informed men on the state of Ireland, calculate the money, drawn out of the country by absentees, at two millions. Will men reside in a country in proportion as the inducement is diminished? What affection can they feel for a tenantry, of whom, they know nothing but from the representations of a resident oppressive steward; conveyed through the medium of an English agent, whose constant instruction is, to take care that the rent is paid to the very day! Are there not some English estates in this country, where punctuality of remittance, being the tenure by which the agent holds his employment, there is a continual cant held upon the lands, of the goods of the unfortunate cultivators of the soil, between whom and the head-landlord, frequently, two or three persons intervene?

The drain arising from absentees will be increased, and the drain of taxation added. Admitting,

ting, for the sake of argument, that the Union would give commercial capability, its purchase would be new taxes. The acquirements of commerce are gradual, the burthens of taxation immediate. To improve a country by making imposts precede wealth, is most preposterous. And calls to mind, the ingenious architect in Gulliver's voyage to Laputa, who contrived a new method of building houses by beginning at the roof, and working downward to the foundation.

The residence of men of large fortune in a country, is attended with great advantage. If you pass through a county where the men of property, for the most part, reside; you will distinguish the estate of the absentee by the squalid wretchedness of his tenantry, and the miserable state of cultivation. Men of property originate all improvements in agriculture; the actual farmer cannot bear the risk. They enable him to make the experiment. Let these men reside in another country. The farmer no longer encouraged by the flattering praise of a man of rank; and not receiving the assistance of his fortune to indemnify him for incurred loss, will have no motive to such undertakings.

The writer has declared that our absentees will not be encreased. and that the absentees from Scotland, were not augmented after the Union. In this he is mistaken; every Scotch writer of eminence, acknowledges the encrease of absentees, as one of its unavoidable evils. I admit, her absentees bear little
proportion

proportion to the absentees of Ireland, and still less, to what they will do, after the Union. Large fortunes in Scotland are not so numerous as in Ireland: a great part of her lands, are held by persons from three to five hundred pounds a year income: such small estates require the constant residence and active attention of their proprietors, and do not permit emigration. After an Union, all the large fortunes, all the talented poverty of the country, will depart. And wealth, and genius, the great sources of national aggrandisement, will be lost to Ireland. Our *riches will center in Britain, and we shall retain no more specie, than will be sufficient to pay the wages of the labouring part of the community. Long before the banks ceased to pay in coin, you might have travelled, from one end of Scotland to the other, without seeing a guinea. In some places, there are bank notes for a crown, and I am well informed, even for a much smaller sum. The specie of Scotland, at the time of the Union, was rated at one million. It is not now more than one fifth of that amount. Has Scotland found in the British Legislature, the fostering hand of a natural parent, or the cold neglect of a step mother? The scheme of uniting the Firth of Forth, and the Firth of Clyde by a canal, was first conceived in the reign of Charles II. The Scotch had then a separate Parliament. It was often resumed, and often laid aside. No assistance was given by the government: a few spirited individuals embarked in the project; when they wanted about five miles of its completion,

* Vide Pofflethwaite's Com. Int. Gt. Bri. v. 1. p. 204, 232.

pletion, they were obliged to stop, on account of the difficulty of the foil. The capital was spent, and in that state it remained a number of years. The merchants of Glasgow have since finished it. But I do not find from its commencement, to its accomplishment, that it was ever assisted with a single shilling from the British Treasury. A cut across the Isthmus of Cantyre, would shorten the voyage from the Hebrides to the main land, by one hundred miles; and prevent the necessity to the Herring buffes, of a dangerous passage round the Mull. In bad weather they are frequently obliged to run into harbour, and from the delay, the profits of the voyage are lost to the proprietors. About twelve miles farther, to the N. W. are two fine lochs, which might be united at the expence of 17,000*l*. To cut across the Isthmus of Cantyre would require 34,000*l*. The conscientious economy of a British Legislature, cannot afford to squander 51,000*l*. on Scotch improvement. The* same body promised fifty shillings a ton bounty to the shipping engaged in the fishery. It was withheld from year to year. It was then reduced to thirty shillings; and Adam Smith† proves the whole is, under a management, at variance with true political economy. In the first instance, what can be said for the good faith? In the second, if Smith is right, what can be said for the wisdom of the British Legislature? And why should Ireland yield the management of her concerns, to such honesty, and such talents?

E

lents?

* For the above mentioned account of Scotland, vide Guthries Geog. 5th ed. 4to. Lon. 1792.

† Smith's Wealth of Nations, vol. 2. p. 14 to 19.

lents? If Scotland has received such wonderful improvement from the Union, why are so great a proportion of her peasantry soldiers? Why do so many of her middle and upper ranks, embrace the military profession *as the means of subsistence*? A thing, not even in the imagination of an Irishman or Englishman. Why are so many of her sons fortune-making in England—in Ireland? Why are they insinuating themselves into all the classes of society in every country in Europe? Why are they freezing at the poles, and burning at the equator, in the pursuit of that subsistence which their country is unable to afford? What says Anderson of Scotland? He represents her, notwithstanding the Union, in the sickly state of a hot-house plant, which requires the most careful attention of the most skilful gardener; and seriously advises England to withdraw her attention from India, and addict herself to the cultivation of Scotland; a strong proof, no doubt, of English attention to Scotch improvement.* At the time of the Union, the Lords of the Articles resembled a Legislating Privy Council. They prepared all the business for Parliament. They were notoriously under the management of the Court, so that the Parliament was in general effectually controuled. The Lords sat in one house with the Commons; and the Crown having the power of creating Peers, the Commons were as dust in the balance: Yet on some occasions, the Lords of the Articles, the Parliament, and the People were in unison.

In

* Vide his account of the West of Scotland and the Hebrides.

In the interval between the Revolution and the Union, the Scotch exhibited judgment, spirit, and talents. Their Darien expedition, their African company, evince wise commercial enterprize. And their Parliamentary eloquence, proves how much even such an assembly as theirs, nurtured and matured genius.

At no period, says Mac Pherson, " did Scotland abound with so many men of real talent. Has she in an hundred years since, produced men like * Montrose, Dundee and Fletcher ?

A bill had been brought into Parliament, not as the writer asserts, that their Monarch should never be the same person, as the King of England; but that the Crowns should never be united, till Scotch independence was secured from English influence. They made but a bad bargain: Their Parliament was bought. Their Constitution was surrendered. The nation was discontented. Had not the victories of Marlborough prevented Lewis XIV. seizing the favourable moment, the Union of the countries would have effected their separation. The partisans of the house of Stewart, were recruited among the friends of the Revolution. And Fletcher, associating the Hanoverian succession with the degradation of his country, would have placed the Scotch Crown on the head of the Pretender.†

E 2

The

* Montrose lived in the time of the civil wars. He was a Royalist; but that vigorous character was formed in an independent nation.

† Vide Mac Pherson's Hist. reign of Queen Anne, vol. 2.

The Union was so hated by the people, that the Chevalier, and his son Charles Edward, at their respective invasions, promised to dissolve it. Scotland discontented, broken down by two rebellions, which the Union in some measure provoked, for the first forty years was rather retrograde than progressive. The mild wisdom of Pelham laid the foundation of her present improvement; she was encouraged by Lord Chatham. She has experienced fifty years tranquillity; the pretensions of the house of Stewart being long since extinguished. The indignant spirits who felt national humiliation as individual debasement, having perished on the scaffold, or died in obscurity, there was nothing left to disturb her repose. The literature of Scotland cannot be attributed to the Union. Long before that period, Scotland was famous for classical and scientific learning. The small livings of her Church, send her men of talents into the Universities, and in their new situation, their emoluments depending on their reputation, they are forced to exertion. It may with more propriety be said, that Scotland has improved notwithstanding the Union, than that the Union caused her improvement. Since the reign of Queen Anne, Ireland has improved infinitely more than Scotland. And if we had united with England at that period, no doubt our present improvement would be ascribed to that measure. But I am certain, had Scotland been then, what Ireland is now, that even a Scotch Parliament would have rejected it with indignation. Hamilton and Fletcher would have been triumphant,

ant, and the daring, profligate treachery, which proposed it, would have experienced the resentment of an insulted country.

Before arguments drawn from other countries can have weight, it will be necessary to shew, that these countries have benefited by the measure, and that *our* situation and *theirs* is so similar, that what has been useful to them, would be to us an advantage. The state of the Heptarchy was so inapplicable, that it were absurd to mention it; but there is at this moment a striking similarity between the connexion of England and Ireland, and of the United States of America, with each other. We have each our separate Legislatures; the Union of the Crown corresponds with the controuling power of Congress, and preserves the individuality of the empire. Again, says the pamphlet, our situation, if united, would be similar to Wales—and we should have no more reason to complain of the small number of our representatives, than that country, or Yorkshire,

I shall meet the argument fairly. It is a loss to both these places, that their interests are left to a body, with the majority of which they have little connection. Small portions of territory are obliged to incorporate. It is an evil to which they must submit. They balance advantage and loss; though they suffer something one way, yet they gain in another, and on the whole, they acquire more than they lose. But, is the relative situation of Ireland

land and England, the same of Wales or Scotland with that country? The Irish channel is broader and deeper than the Tweed or the Severn. Will the Union throw a bridge between the countries, or cause the alternate blowing of the East and West winds, to secure their uninterrupted intercourse? Whatever advantage the present connection may have, THE POWER *who at the beginning "gathered the waters together, and made the dry land appear," has, by the interposition of the ocean, placed an eternal barrier against their Union.*

Suppose the 3d Edward, or the 5th Henry, had succeeded in their attempts on France, England might have heard much of the advantages of an incorporate Union with the French monarchy. There would have been Frenchmen in the then deputy government of England, who would have reviled her legislature, who would have told her, that London, was not even at so great a distance from Paris as Toulon: "That after the Union, her government would be administered with more attention, because it would be less distracted by the business of party and parliament, and therefore more impartially." Experience has demonstrated, that this would have been nothing more than plausible nonsense. What reply would the high feeling of an Englishman make to such arguments? And what respect do they deserve from a subject of the British empire? Since, if they prove any thing, they demonstrate that Britain should become a province of France. Irishmen
are

are to sit in the British cabinet. Ireland would receive great advantage, and, no doubt, British liberty would be greatly improved.

Two more of the gentleman's examples are most unfortunate for his argument: The United Provinces separating from Spain, and the late incorporations of France. Look in the map of Europe. Is the commercial situation of Ireland inferior to that of Holland? Next, compare them in the extent of their territory, in the number and genius of their people, in wholesomeness of climate, fertility of soil, in broad and deep rivers, in capacious harbours. What was the strength of the Dutch and the Spanish Monarchy in the last century? What is the strength of Ireland and Great Britain at the present day? But I shall pursue this point no farther, as it might lead to the discussion of a question, I am determined to avoid. I now proceed to examine with what propriety the French incorporations, have been selected for British imitations. France has not universally acted on the incorporating principle. The Batavian, Cisalpine, and Italian republics demonstrate, that she can respect the natural boundaries of nations. It may be objected, these independent nations are devoted to her interest. Is not Ireland devoted to the interest of Britain? The incorporation of the other countries, must have resulted from force or affection. If from the latter, the inhabitants received the French as their deliverers, from the oppression of their former rulers. Are we reduced to that desperate

perate state which makes a change of masters indifferent? Or are we absolutely obliged to take refuge from the cruel injustice of an Irish parliament, in the generous liberality of an English Legislature? The other alternative will as little avail the writer. I will ask him—Is Ireland so situated with England as those countries were with France? Can Ireland be compelled to an Union? Even the proud presumption of the English minister would hesitate at answering the question in the affirmative. And no real friend of the British empire would wish a trial of the experiment.

Will it tranquillize the country? No. It will encrease, rather than calm the discontent of the people, and will create discontent in the gentry.

The promises addressed to the Protestants and Catholics, are so much at variance, and the threats held out so inconsistent, that the performance of the one, and the execution of the other, are equally impossible. An Union would not destroy the argument of numbers, which the Catholics enjoy, Compared with the Protestants of the empire, they are a minority; with the Protestants of Ireland, a majority. They will be equally so, after an Union, unless they are transplanted into Britain, and blended with their Protestant fellow subjects of that country. If the Protestant votes for the Union, his ascendancy is to be preserved. If the Catholic consents, an opening shall be left for his future admission to additional privileges. If the Protestant refuses, the Catholics are to be taken by the hand; as the British
Cabinet

Cabinet is only bound to preserve Ireland to the English crown, not to any particular mode of preserving the connection. Yet Catholic refusal is to be punished by the rigid maintenance of Protestant ascendancy. There is a passage of the pamphlet well worth attention. Speaking of Protestant ascendancy——

“Who,” says the writer, “will be the guarantee of that system, and whom will it content? The Catholics will not acquiesce in its propriety. A party of Protestants in Ireland deem it unjust and absurd; another party in England term it by fouler names; great leaders in opposition, possibly the future ministers of England, may condemn it; and some members of the British Cabinet are supposed to be adverse to it. Its stability may rest upon accident, upon the death of a *single* character, upon the change of a minister, on the temper of a Lord Lieutenant; and the policy of this system is much doubted by the people of England.” Will the Protestant, ever so much attached to his ascendancy, sacrifice the independence of his country, to preserve a system, whose continuation is now acknowledged to depend on circumstances, over which an Union can have no controul? Will the Catholic embrace an Union, when, in the present state of the connection, so many things unite in inspiring a rational hope, that his emancipation will shortly be effected? * I am

F astonished

* The writer's observations on the state of property in Ireland, bring to my mind, the modern Atheists and Deists, who are continually reproducing the old arguments of Lucretius, Spinoza, Hobbs, Bolingbroke and Tindal, notwithstanding they have been so often completely refuted.

astonished, that the Author is not better informed, than to assert, that the Dissenting interest has little share in the present representation. The whole county representation of the province of Ulster, is almost entirely in the hands of Dissenters. At present, they bear a much greater proportion to the Protestant interest of Ireland, than they would do after an Union, (though joined with the English Dissenters) to the * Protestant interest of the empire. Besides, there being no test laws against them in this country, they enjoy the capacity of filling all public employments, and as these laws are in force in England, their condition would be rather deteriorated than improved by the Union †.

The gentleman fears the opposition of the metropolis and the Bar. He endeavours to do away that of the metropolis.—That of the Bar he cannot overcome. He therefore treats them the way the Quaker did the dog he found in his pantry—I will neither beat thee, nor kill thee, but I will give thee a bad name. He relieves the fears of Dublin, by the example of Edinburgh. This argument will

* I have used the word Protestant, according to its vulgar meaning in this country; though I could never perceive the propriety of applying it exclusively to the Protestants of the established church.

† Supposing that the enactment of a test law for Ireland would not be the consequence of the Union, which probably it would; yet as many Dissenters, who now live here, would reside then in England, they would suffer, as it is not likely, that there would be an exception in the English test act, in favour of Irish Dissenters.

will only avail with those who have seen but one of these cities. That Edinburgh has improved since the Union, I admit. But if any certain conclusion can be drawn from this mode of reasoning, Dublin has improved much more within the same period. And whether Edinburgh can in any degree be compared with Dublin, in fine buildings, the resort of nobility and gentry, her banking houses, her merchants and manufacturers, the number of inhabitants, the extent of the town, and the greatness of her commerce, in all which the prosperity of a capital is supposed to consist, let persons answer, who have visited both places.

Should the Union take place, our principal nobility and gentry would go to London, and those of moderate fortune will never visit our capital, but live penuriously on their estates in the country, and every two or three years take their families to some English watering place, for the purpose of making connections. Dublin, we are told, will still be the residence of a Viceroy and his court. So much the worse. We shall have all the vices of an independent government, without its advantages. The great offices of state will be continued. From want of employment they will be sinecures; and the salaries will be spent in London. If our own Parliament were all placemen and pensioners, the consequence would not be so pernicious. Their ill-gotten wealth would at least be spent in the country, and circulate among the people from whom it was extracted, as the vapours exhaled from the earth

return to it in rain. Our merchants and barristers will necessarily be excluded from the representation; and it will be entirely confined to a few landholders. That the merchants should have a share, no one can deny. We will examine the advantage of excluding the legal profession. Barristers having seats in Parliament, is a powerful controul over the conduct of Judges, not only in securing their respectful demeanour to the bar, but also the faithful discharge of their public duty. The law officers of the Crown will always sit in that assembly; and in the discussion of judicial delinquency (if ever such a question should arise) were there no lawyers in the ranks of opposition, the servants of the Crown would have great advantage over the country gentlemen. They will not be so ready, should they have the inclination, to advance illegal positions in support of arbitrary power, when they know that detection and the loss of professional * character will be the consequence. Perhaps some men may have attained by politics, situations to which professional merit would never have raised them; but in this country there have been, and there are judges who never sat in Parliament, and others who did, that will not suffer by comparison with the greatest judicial characters of England. The mention of one man who is now
no

* The pamphlet states that it is the habit of the gentlemen of Ireland, to educate their sons at the Temple. But of that description how few practise the profession? On examination I do not think that there are more practising barristers in the Irish Parliament, than there are in the English.

no more cannot excite envy. Who was beloved by his friends, admired by all who knew him, and revered by his country—I mean HUSSEY BURGH. The House of Commons was his path to the bench. No court sycophancy,—no mean compliance,—no desertion of his country's rights marked his way. He kept a steady upright course, and never deviated from the line of honour. Placed on the seat of justice, in the prime of life—in the full possession of his splendid talents, he was snatched from us by a malignant fever. The ways of Providence are inscrutable—Him we have lost.—May we on the present trying occasion feel the inspiration of his virtues!

The profession will indeed be degraded. The different departments will be all filled by Englishmen, and neither Phipps nor Whitshed afford any reason to rejoice in English Chancellors, or English Judges. Scotland, by her Union, lost the abilities of a MANSFIELD and an ERSKINE. Had we been United with England, we should have been without a YELVERTON and a CURRAN.

Our Church establishment may be preserved—not for the Irish clergy, but for English incumbents. The difference of laws, and a poor Church establishment secured Scotland from those evils.

What is this Union to produce? It is to encrease our commerce and manufactures, by yielding them up to the management of the commercial and manufacturing monopoly of Britain, which is in opposition to the real interest of the empire. It is to promote

promote our agriculture, and civilize our people, by taking away those persons, who by their skill and fortune, can best advance the cultivation of lands; and by their manners reclaim the lower classes of society. It is to tranquillize the country, by encreasing the discontent of the people, and creating the discontent of the gentry. It is to give employment to our population, by turning our manufacturers and husbandmen into sailors and soldiers, to navigate the ships, and fight the battles of commercial jealousy, and destructive ambition.

The Bar is to be meliorated by a plan which will seduce all Irish talent to England, and send English incapacity to Ireland. Irish trade is to be protected by excluding the Irish merchant from the Legislature. The dignity of our peerage is to be secured by taking away its Legislative capacity: And finally, the vices of our own Parliament are to be corrected by its extinction: and the management of our concerns to be surrendered for ever, to an Assembly not superior to our own in *talents or virtue*.*
If at the end of fifty years, Ireland owes twelve millions, at the close of a century, England owes five hundred. If an Irish parliament has on many occasions sacrificed the real interests of Ireland, to the
false

* Some years ago, the Irish legislature secured their country against the injustice of Portugal; the British Minister and the British legislature, never interposed in our favour.

† Ireland, in the year 1753, did not owe a shilling. The debt of England commenced at the Revolution. I believe I have stated the debts of both countries, nearly as they are.

false interests of Britain, an English one has as often laid at the feet of a few individuals, the true interests of the British empire. If the Irish Secretary can command his hollow majority at Dublin, the British Minister can do so at Westminster. The truth is, that vice and virtue, are not the peculiar attributes of any individuals, or of any country. Where there are great temptations, human nature is not always able to resist : And at present, the inducements to Senatorial prostitution, are as strong in England as in Ireland.

The gentleman, speaking of the state of the country, says, " That all her accession of prosperity has been of no avail, that discontent has kept pace with improvement, discord has grown up with our wealth, conspiracy and rebellion have shot up with our prosperity." It would not be difficult, without being " a shrewd diviner," to assign other causes for conspiracy and rebellion, than wealth, prosperity, and improvement. The future historian may relate

* * * * *

To propose an Union at such a time—to advise Britain to take advantage of our present unhappy state. If a man should insinuate himself into a private house, take advantage of the prejudices of its different inmates, to throw all into discord ; and in the midst of the confusion, make an attempt on the family estate : What epithet would such conduct deserve ? What punishment should it experience ? The writer asserts, " That Dr. M'Nevin, " and

“and the United Irishmen declare, that Catholic
 “Emancipation and Reform, are the certain fore-
 “runners of separation and republicanism.” Whether they do so or not, I have no means of being informed.* I shall venture to think for myself upon those subjects; as far as I am able to judge, they would have a contrary tendency. It strikes me, the King and the people are equally injured by the present system of representation, and the borough proprietors are the only gainers. The gentleman himself cannot think that the former of these measures will work these effects; as in one part of his pamphlet, where he wishes to frighten the refractory Protestants into an Union, he tells them, that Great Britain is not bound to support one sect more than another, and asks, “What is to debar her from assisting the Catholics?” That a Reform will not lead to Republicanism, but to a preservation of the constitution; I have the opinions of Locke, Montesquieu, De Lolme, Hales, Blackstone, Burleigh, and Chatham; and if the gentleman, whoever he may be, and those with whom he is connected, think differently, he and they must

* I was rather inadvertent when I said, in the first edition of this pamphlet, “that I had no means of being informed.” I have since procured the Reports of the Secret Committees of the Lords and Commons, and perused the examinations of Dr. M’Nevin. I do not find that in either he gives it as his opinion, “That Catholic
 “Emancipation and Reform are the certain introduction
 “to separation and republicanism.” See Rep. of Lords, App. 3. Dr. M’Nevin’s examination, Rep. of Com. App. 1. Ibid.

must excuse me, if I recollect the maxim, "malim errare cum Scaligero, quam rectè sentire cum aliis." He asks, "If our situation be imputable to mal-administration, who can secure us from its recurrence? If to the instability of affairs, who can insure their future consistency?" I answer, that Britain has often experienced mal-administration, and that instability is the lot of human affairs.

With respect to our religious differences, I earnestly beseech the Almighty to infuse into our minds the true spirit of the Gospel, and heal those divisions that have bathed our country in blood, and made us weak, when we should be strong. Time will do much. An Union with England will do nothing.

Damnosa quid non imminuit dies?

The Union is mischievous to British freedom, unnecessary to the promotion of true British interest. "Caligula wished that the people of Rome had but one neck," there may be men who wish that the liberties of the empire had but one security. The Irish members, always at the devotion of the Court, the Irish population, converted into a mercenary army, would be powerful instruments in the hands of profligate ambition. And, at a future period, should a minister arise, who would rather have his Sovereign feared than loved, the despot of slaves, not the King of a free people. An Irish soldiery, at the mandate of such a wretch, if force were necessary, would be as ready to beat down British liberty in the field, as their countrymen were to sell it in the Senate. Cromwell, to secure his unlawful power, forced the kingdom, exhausted by civil wars, into an Union. He called thirty members to the kind of parliament he established. In Britain, the friends of freedom clamoured against the measure. But Cromwell had his red regiment.

G

IRISHMEN,

I R I S H M E N.

Our unhappy distractions have been urged as a necessity for the Union. Dreadful, indeed, has been the conflict. There has been much to be lamented. There is no reason to despond. In the midst of our calamities, I discover the seeds of future aggrandizement. We have great vices. We have great virtues. Has cruelty been awake? Humanity has not slept. We have witnessed the hardy virtue of antiquity. In horror at its effects, I discern the future extinction of religious bigotry. And I behold a divided valour, which, if united, would secure us against the attack of the proudest foe, and defend our liberties against the world in arms.

*Per domna, per cædes, ab ipsa
Ducit opes animumque ferro.*

Were an extravagant young man, to secure his future frugality, to deliver his estate to the management of a *notorious old spendthrift*, and sign a bond never to call him to account for the profits? Were a freeman voluntarily to become a slave? Would you not laugh at the folly of the one, and despise the baseness of the other. Yet such will be your conduct, if you make an incorporate Union. In any other settlement, the infringement of the articles is a dissolution of the compact. But an incorporate Union annihilates the contracting parties without the power of revival. It will bind us in an adamant chain which we can never

ver break. It will take from us for ever the disposal of our property, the regulation of our conduct. It is the attempt of human presumption to grasp the power of Omnipotence, not for the benevolent purposes of the Deity, to break the connection of cause and effect, to counteract the bounties of nature, to limit the progress of improvement, to make prosperity stationary. All shall be fixed, unalterable, irrevocable. The roll of ages, the vicissitudes of empires, shall not meliorate your condition. *And time and chance which happeneth to all men, shall alone never come to you.*

Were an Union fraught with blessings, as it is with curses—Were it the elixir of life, not the potion of death. You ought to reject it.

There are crimes which no bribe could tempt a moral man to commit. There is a baseness, than to stoop to which, a man of honour should rather die. Individually, you are high-spirited.—Be so collectively.

Can you consent to the extinction of your name and characters? Will you, after being for two thousand years numbered among the nations of the earth, meanly sink into a province, turn traitors to Heaven, and yield up the freedom granted by the Almighty? The man who tells you that national honour is nothing, is ignorant of the human heart, and uninstructed by the experience of ages.

Did not the emulation of free States, cause the mighty progress of antient Greece in science, arts, and arms? In less than one hundred and fifty years she produced more eminent poets, philosophers, legislators, statesmen and warriors, than modern Europe supplied in ten centuries. In every thing that can adorn and elevate, she has never been surpassed. And through succeeding generations, has been the model to an admiring world, of all that can embellish domestic life, and dignify public character. Such was Greece—while Greece was FREE. See her when a

Roman province. Could the debauched sophists of Athens, and the degenerate Spartans, vie with the heroes of Salamis and Platea, the conquerors of Persia? Do the present Turkish slaves possess the virtues of their ancestors! Sufficiently connected with England for common defence, sufficiently distinct for the rivalry of separate exertion; we enjoy that mixture of Union and Independence, which must tend more to the aggrandizement of the empire, than if we were incorporated with, or separated for ever from Great Britain.

What is the true opinion of the Scotch on their Union? Read it in the enthusiastic praises bestowed by their historians on those heroes, who from the days of WALLACE to the time of FLETCHER, had fought, spoke, and died, for the independence of their native land.

What is the reason that no man can sell his liberty? It is, because the moment he becomes a slave, the person who bought him, can take from him, the very price for which he sold his freedom. Can the Parliament do that for you, which you cannot do for yourselves. “** Their power is not an arbitrary power. They are trustees, not the owners of the estate. The fee simple is in the people.*” One part of your ancestors received a Constitution from the 2d Henry, and guarded their independence with a watchful jealousy. † Another often bled in the field, to acquire the

* Vide Junius's dedication of his letters to the English nation. In the reign of Charles 2d. twenty-three lay lords signed a protest, declaring that the privilege of sitting and voting in Parliament, was an honour they had by birth; a right so inherent in them, that nothing could take it away, but what by the law of the land, took away their lives and corrupted their blood.

† See the declaration of the Irish Lords and Commons, on being summoned to England by Edward the 3d Leland's History of Ireland, vol. 1. p. 328.

the participation of its privileges *. And a third are to be found amongst those, who in Scotland successfully resisted the tyranny of 1st Charles.† Emulate your progenitors, and reverence yourselves. What your forefathers were to you, be ye to your children, that they may not curse you in your grave. Swift first taught Ireland to know herself. LUCAS bade Magna Charta speak freedom to Irishmen, in a language they could understand. GRATTAN, BURGH, and FLOOD acquired Commerce and Constitution. The last of whom, by the Act of Renunciation, placed the dome on the temple of Irish independence.

Will you surrender that independence? Will you renounce the renunciation? Will you give away the fruits of the labour, the talents, the integrity of these men? Many of you have sworn to defend the Constitution. Let not Heaven then witness your perjury. *Banish all party feeling, all party prejudice, AND THE HEAD, HEART, AND HAND OF IRELAND, SHALL SUCCESSFULLY OPPOSE AN UNION.*

* Vide the demands of the Irish Catholics. *Lel. Hist. of Ire.* vol. 3, p. 228.

† A great number of the Northerners of this kingdom, are descended from the Scotch Covenanters.

☛ *The last budget of the British Minister, affords MILLIONS of arguments against an UNION, on the score of taxes.*

P O S T S C R I P T.

THE ridiculous jargon, that the debts of a nation encrease its riches, by increasing the circulation, is now completely exploded.

The absurdity originated from confounding the paper which is the sign of the profits of commerce, with that paper which is the sign of a debt. It was concluded to be the sign of wealth, because none but rich nations could support such paper without being ruined. That they were not, was because they had other riches. It was not an evil, because there were resources against it. It was an advantage, because the resources surpassed the mischief*. Smith † says, the practice of funding has gradually enfeebled every State which adopted it. And that it is not to be expected, that a practice pernicious in every other country, should in Britain alone be innocent. Let us not imagine, says he, that she can support any burthen, or that she could bear with facility a little greater than what she already sustains. The assessed taxes, the imposts upon income are beginning to teach England, experimentally, that DEBTS are not RICHES. The expences of this war have been enormous; in less than six years of its continuance, it has exceeded the whole expence of the American; which was then supposed the

* Mont. Sp. of Laws, vol. 2. Sec. Pub. Debts.

† Wealth of Nations, vol. 2. p. 468, 469.

the greatest limit of ministerial extravagance. In this period, above two hundred millions have been raised, on which the premium was sixty-three millions. During the eight years which the American war lasted, the sum raised was about one hundred and twenty-eight millions, on which the premium was twenty-three millions. Compare these additions, with the times in which they were contracted, and their respective premiums; the inference is highly in favour of Lord North's administration. The difference of the expences of the eight years of the American, and the six years of the present war; and the different ratio of the premiums to the sums raised, cannot altogether result from the depreciation of the value of money. The bushel of wheat in 1780 was 4s. 5½d. in 1795 it was 7s. 10d. Allowing nine bushels to the quarter, which is what Smith allows in his table; the quarter of wheat in 1782 was 2l. and 1½d. In 1795 it was 3l. 10s. 6d. When we recollect that the year 1795 was a year of great scarcity, on account of the severe frost, the quarter loaf in London being part of that year sixteen pence, though for the two or three preceding years it had been from six pence to nine pence; the depreciation of the value of money from 1780 to 1795, is less than the difference of the price of wheat for those years. Wheat was certainly cheaper in the year 1796, in all probability is so at the present time. If the depreciation of the value of money cannot account for a sum raised in somewhat less than six years, so greatly exceeding the sum raised in eight years: What can be said for the œconomy of the ministers? And if the same cause is insufficient as to the different ratios which the premiums bear to their respective additions to the debt, either public credit is much lower in this war than it was in the American, or else there cannot be that encrease of capital in England, which the writer states "embarrasses the monied men, notwithstanding the enormous loans to government,

“vernment, how to invert the redundancy with advantage and security.”

The debt of England is at this moment above five hundred millions. Should the war continue two years longer, which is not unlikely, to estimate the encrease of debt at seventy millions is not unfair. Suppose an Union now take place, were Ireland to bear no portion of the antecedent burthen, which is by no means certain, not at all probable,—How could she support such a share of the subsequent debt as a British Legislature would impose? It was formerly suggested, when this measure was considered, that taxation in Ireland should, after an Union, bear the same ratio to population, which it does in Britain. The population of Ireland is to that of the sister country, as one to four. Would we in two years, be adequate to taxes sufficient to pay the interest of seventeen millions? If we were to obtain great commercial capabilities, which we will not, attended with such burthens—What would be the advantage? England is enabled to bear her present burthens from having enjoyed for centuries an uncontrouled government, and unrestricted trade. What is past cannot be recalled. With respect to the time of enjoyment these countries will never be on an equality. Their situations are so dissimilar, no common rule of impost and regulation can be applied. To ascertain a just proportion will be most difficult. None but the separate Parliaments of England and Ireland collecting from local information and minute attention, the exact variations of their respective prosperity, can determine with accurate impartiality, how much each should contribute to the common expence of the empire. Had the interest of an enormous debt at an early period interrupted the progress of British genius and industry, would England be at all equal to the present emergency? The foundation of England's commercial greatness was laid in the frugal reign of Elizabeth.

Her

Her advancement was rapid * between the Restoration and the Revolution. Civilization and refinement had then excited a spirit of improvement, and created a luxury which called upon commerce and invention to supply their wants. And the public burthens being small compared with individual wealth, no oppressive taxation impeded the operations of ingenuity and labour. † Smith conceived the plan of an incorporate Union of all the members of the empire, for the purpose of extending the system of British taxation over every part. After having amused the English reader for a few pages with a golden dream, he wakes him to the perception of the real inanity of the plan, by stating difficulties which it may be supposed, he himself thought insurmountable. As he recommends it to England, if it should be found that the scheme was impracticable to economise her expediture, and moderate her ambition as her only future resources.

* Hume's History of England, vol. 8. p. 258 to 263.

† The revenue of Charles II. including the grants during his reign, did not average more than one million and a half per annum. The Revenue of James II. was two millions a year. The debt of England at the Revolution was one million and fifty-four thousand nine hundred and twenty-five pounds. Ibid.

‡ Smith, vol. 2, p. 472 to the end.

*** I am aware it may be urged as an objection to part of the above reasoning; that any future addition to the debt of England cannot be considerable, as the Minister seems determined for the remainder of the war, to raise within the current year, a great part of the principal sum wanted. That he will be able to do so, I much doubt. Last year, notwithstanding the assessed taxes, which were deficient by two millions of what they were expected to produce, a considerable loan was made on the old plan. And this year fourteen millions are to be raised in the old way, in addition to the sum which it is supposed will result from the impost upon income. I will

I will venture to predict, that the deficiency in this new scheme of finance, will be greater than what occurred in the assessed taxes. There has been, since the commencement of the present war, an annual average deficiency in the taxes; and when a nation is inadequate to pay the interest of the existing debt, to insist upon the raising a great part of the principal sum wanted, within the year; resembles the Egyptians commanding the Israelites to make brick without straw.

The majority of our population are so wretchedly poor, they use few things from which a revenue can be collected. The leather of their brogues, and their whiskey cannot well be taxed higher, without diminishing the consumption. Any large addition to the present taxation of Ireland must be borne chiefly by the middle ranks, and those immediately above them. This, in time, will effect the diminution of these orders, and all classes of society will, at last, merge into two. THE RICH and the POOR. Congenial as this may be to a despotic government, it is totally incompatible with a free State. The preservation of the middle rank of citizens, and the existence of liberty are inseparably connected. ANNILILATE THE ONE—YOU DESTROY THE OTHER.

FINIS.

6 DE 58